

REMARKS

Claims 1-20 were previously pending in the application. Claims 3, 4, 10, 11, 19 and 20 are cancelled and new claims 21-23 are added. Therefore, claims 1, 2, 5-9, 12-18 and 21-23 are presented for consideration.

Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for indicating allowable subject matter in claims 4, 7-8 and 13-18. In reliance thereon, claims 13, 16 and 17 are rewritten in independent form and claim 1 is amended to include the subject matter of claim 4.

Dependent claims 5-9 which originally depended from claim 3 are made dependent from claim 1. Claims 12, 14 and 15 are amended to depend from claim 13. Claim 18 is also amended to depend from claim 1.

Since claims 1, 2, 5-9 and 12-18 are directed to subject matter indicated as allowable or depend from a claim indicated as allowable, these claims are believed in condition for allowance.

New claims 21-23 are added herewith. New claim 21 is directed to the specific embodiment of the perforated metal sheet recited in claim 13. Since claim 21 depends from claim 13, this claim is also believed allowable.

New independent claim 22 is similar to claim 4 except that the limitation of the filaments pre-impregnated with a thermosetting or thermoplastic resin is replaced with a

recitation that strips of perforated sheet are secured to the parallel strips. Since a point of patentability is believed to be emplacing an element only astride the intervals between parallel strips, whether the element placed is filaments or strips of perforated sheet is not believed to affect the patentability. Accordingly, claim 22 is also believed patentable. New claim 23 depends from claim 22 and is similar to claim 21 and is also believed patentable.

Since the claims remaining in the application are directed to the subject matter indicated as allowable or depend from a claim indicated as allowable or include a variant of an allowable claim, the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) set forth in the Official Action over PORTE et al. 6,268,038 is believed moot. Similarly, the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection over PORTE et al. is also believed moot.

Page 3 of the Official Action indicates that the allowable subject matter would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph rejections set forth in the Official Action. However, no such rejections were set forth. The 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph rejections set forth in the Official Action of May 29, 2003 are believed addressed by the amendment of August 29, 2003. In any event, the present claims are believed in condition for allowance.


In view of the present amendment and the foregoing remarks, it is believed that the present application has been

placed in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 25-0120 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17.

Respectfully submitted,

YOUNG & THOMPSON

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Liam McDowell".

Liam McDowell, Reg. No. 44,231
745 South 23rd Street
Arlington, VA 22202
Telephone (703) 521-2297
Telefax (703) 685-0573
(703) 979-4709

LM/psf